

Draft Memorandum for the Record

Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization Meeting

January 23, 2014 Meeting

10:10 AM – 12:30 PM, State Transportation Building, Conference Rooms 2&3, 10 Park Plaza, Boston

Ned Codd, Chair, representing Richard Davey, Secretary and Chief Executive Officer, Massachusetts Department of Transportation (MassDOT)

Decisions

The Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization agreed to the following:

- approve the work program for *Freight Planning Support – FFY 2014*

Meeting Agenda

1. Public Comments

There were none.

2. Chair's Report—*Ned Codd, MassDOT*

N. Codd reported that MassDOT released the draft *weMove Massachusetts* plan which, along with the agency's Capital Investment Plan (CIP), forms the statewide long-range transportation plan. This strategic plan is required under law passed by the state legislature. The CIP is a five-year plan based upon anticipated federal revenues that will be programmed through the MPO process and also on other revenue sources.

John Romano, MassDOT Highway Division, announced that MassDOT will be holding a series of public meetings regarding these plans. The schedule is posted on MassDOT's website.

Discussion

Tom Kadzis, City of Boston, inquired about how MassDOT will be updating the CIP as MPOs approve projects. N. Codd replied that the intention is for the CIP to include all projects on regional Transportation Improvement Programs (TIPs), which make up the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). The CIP is in a draft state now; MassDOT staff is working to ensure that all TIP/STIP projects are included in the document.

David Koses, At-Large City of Newton, noted that the CIP includes a long-range vision for MBTA service and asked if that topic would be discussed at the public meetings, and if not, when the public would have an opportunity to comment. N. Codd explained that the proposal for the creation of a broader system of diesel multiple unit (DMU) service may be discussed at the meetings, but not at a high level of detail. MassDOT is currently planning for the implementation of DMU service on the Fairmount commuter rail corridor. While the Patrick Administration sees great potential for the use of DMUs in the region, the proposal for a broader system of DMUs is in the conceptual stage and has not been vetted by the public. N. Codd noted that the CIP meetings and associated public review period would be a good place for the public to comment. He also noted that there will be more opportunities in the future for the public to weigh in on the DMU proposal. D. Koses noted that the residents and municipal leadership of Newton would welcome a public meeting in Newton on this topic.

3. Committee Chairs' Reports

Sreelatha Allam, MassDOT, reported that the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) Committee met this morning and discussed the quarterly report. The committee will meet next on February 20, 2014 to discuss the proposed FFY 2015 Universe of Projects.

Lourenço Dantas, Massachusetts Port Authority, reminded members that the Congestion Management Committee will meet this afternoon following the meeting of the MPO.

4. Regional Transportation Advisory Council Report—*David Montgomery, Chair, Regional Transportation Advisory Council*

D. Montgomery reported that the Advisory Council is giving thought to how it can be more directly connected to the work of the MPO. He enumerated several items that the Council is working on.

The Council is developing a list of topics and speakers for the coming year's meetings. MassDOT's Office of Transportation Planning is assisting in the development of the speaker list.

The Council is also reviewing its process for submitting comments about the certification documents to the MPO and is open to revising its process. The Council is appreciative of the substantive response it has received from the MPO in response to the comments the Council submitted last year in regards to the TIP and UPWP.

To expand its membership, the Council is planning to conduct outreach to municipalities that are currently not represented on the Council. It is also preparing a welcome packet that could be posted on the MPO's website. The Council is also taking its role in the MPO's Public Participation Plan seriously.

The Council is also considering revamping its committee system. Currently there are committees for the TIP and UPWP, the Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP), and membership, as well as an ad hoc committee for freight. The goal is to have all of these committees report to Council and for the Council to have a dialog with MPO staff.

D. Montgomery invited MPO members to provide feedback about these ideas.

The Council will meet next on February 12, 2014. Stephanie Pollack of Northeastern University's Dukakis Center for Urban and Regional Policy is the scheduled speaker.

5. Executive Director's Report—*Karl Quackenbush, Executive Director, Central Transportation Planning Staff*

K. Quackenbush reported that the Human Services and Equity in Transportation Forum was held on January 14, 2014. The event was sponsored by the Boston Region MPO, the Metropolitan Area Planning Council (MAPC), the Human Service Transportation Office of the Massachusetts Executive Office of Health and Human Services, and the MassDOT Statewide Mobility Manager (the coordinator of the Statewide Coordinating Council on Community Transportation). The objective of the forum was to gather together individuals from entities that are involved in the provision of transportation services to people whose transportation needs are not met or are difficult to meet, as well as other interested parties.

The event was very successful. There were approximately 60 participants in addition to the sponsors and five panelists. Among the entities represented were transportation agencies, transportation providers, regional planning agencies, MPOs, municipalities, councils on aging, social service organizations, and disability commissions. The breakout discussions focused on identifying gaps in transportation service and successful services that are already operating. The forum provided an opportunity for collaboration and collected information that the MPO will use in the development of the next Coordinated Human-Services Transportation Plan.

Alicia Wilson, MPO staff, and Eric Bourassa, MAPC, were the principal organizers of the event. A summary of information gathered in the breakout sessions is being prepared.

6. Work Program for Freight Planning Support - FFY 2014—Karl Quackenbush, Executive Director, Central Transportation Planning Staff

K. Quackenbush introduced the work program for *Freight Planning Support – FFY 2014*. This work program follows upon the MPO's approval last September of a Freight Action Plan that will guide the MPO's planning on this subject. Freight planning is now considered an ongoing program in the UPWP. The work program presented today outlines the activities staff is proposing for FFY 2014.

Staff is proposing to study freight and associated issues in the Beacham Street corridor of Everett and Chelsea. Staff has already met with officials of the two cities and found them to be enthusiastic about the project. The objective of the work program is to distill the issues that exist in this corridor, develop a profile of existing conditions, and develop and evaluate options to address the identified issues. One issue that may be addressed involves the possible re-routing of trucks to better accommodate the transformation of Spruce Street in Chelsea into an urban boulevard. Another issue that may affect land use in the area is a proposed casino.

The study of this location can serve as a blueprint for the study of other freight corridors in the future. This study will also help to continue to enrich the MPO's data sets.

Discussion

E. Bourassa suggested delaying this study until the state Gaming Commission makes a decision about a proposed casino in Everett, particularly considering that the casino proponent is offering mitigation for added vehicle trip generation in the Beacham Street and Route 99 area. K. Quackenbush replied that it is advisable to start the study now. He noted that the casino would only have a peripheral impact on this study and that MPO staff is not proposing to conduct a formal trip generation study in this case. Staff will remain aware of the casino issue as the study progresses.

L. Dantas asked staff to explain more about the data collection activities of Task 1 of the study and to further elaborate on the previous comments about trip generation. He also suggested that, given that this study will be a blueprint for future freight studies, staff research how this generator of truck activity compares to others in the region. K. Quackenbush noted that while staff will not be conducting a formal trip generation study in this case, some of the data collection would be on truck trip generation. Bill Kuttner, MPO staff, added that the activities in Task 1 include having discussions with municipal planners, surveying the geography of the study area, counting driveways at industrial sites, researching issues related to regional connectivity, and investigating analytic tools available from the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA).

Tom Bent, Inner Core Committee (City of Somerville), expressed support for this study noting the effect that truck traffic in the area has on the cities of Everett and Somerville. He suggested that more resources should be applied to the study if the casino is approved and mitigation funds are available. A new casino would generate more truck traffic feeding into the casino complex, he noted.

D. Montgomery recommended keeping in mind that there are other options for moving freight than trucks, such as rail, and asked if other modes would be considered in the data collection activities of this study. K. Quackenbush noted that trucks are the primary means of moving freight in this region. The Freight Action Plan discusses the interaction between the truck mode and other modes at intermodal terminals. This study is very focused on trucks, however. Efi Pagitsas, MPO staff, added that the cities of Everett and Chelsea are interested in having the MPO study existing conditions to see how freight traffic can be coordinated with other plans. The cities are not focused on studying a mode shift at this time, so that issue is not part of this work program. B. Kuttner also noted that staff does intend to ask businesses about the volumes of freight they receive by all modes, but staff will not be able to look at scenarios of mode shift in this study.

N. Codd pointed out that produce is delivered to the study area by rail. He noted that it is the policy of the state and MPO to encourage use of rail where feasible. Better understanding the existing conditions and constraints will help inform thinking about future opportunities for mode shift, he noted.

D. Montgomery asked if the Gaming Commission is using objective traffic model data (not developed by the casino proponents) of projected traffic demand when siting casinos. He also asked if the MPO's models are being applied. N. Codd replied that the Gaming Commission does take traffic issues into account and that it has hired consultants to provide expertise in areas including transportation planning. Comments on the casino projects are made through the MEPA process and the Gaming Commission's process.

R. Mares asked if the study will be undertaken from the perspective of the freight industry or of the community, and what parameters would be examined (for example, safety, air quality, or environmental justice issues). K. Quackenbush replied that the study will be done with the community perspective in mind and staff will be interacting with the community. While the study is not focused on reducing truck traffic, there is an interest in the community about finding ways to better accommodate other community goals related to land use. This study will not produce the usual metrics that are produced in other MPO studies (such as measures of emissions and environmental justice impacts, for example).

A motion to approve the work program for *Freight Planning Support – FFY 2014* was made by the Inner Core Committee (City of Somerville) (T. Bent), and seconded by MAPC (E. Bourassa). The motion carried.

7. FFY 2013 Route 3A Subregional Priority Roadway Study in Cohasset and Scituate—Chen-Yuan Wang, MPO Staff

C. Wang gave a presentation on the *Subregional Priority Roadway Study* for Route 3A in Cohasset and Scituate. (The *Subregional Priority Roadway Study* also addressed Routes 127 and 127A in Gloucester and Rockport. Staff will report on that portion of the study this spring.)

The study area is a three mile section of Route 3A from the Cohasset commuter rail station to Henry Turner Bailey Road in Scituate. This principal arterial roadway is maintained by MassDOT Highway District Office 5. It carries between 15,000 and 20,000 vehicles per day. There are development projects underway along the roadway and development projects that have been completed in recent years.

The northern section of the study area is a business district, the middle section is residential, and the southern section is a highway business district. Route 3A is a two-lane roadway in this area except for one four-lane section south of Beechwood Street. Nearby are the Greenbush commuter rail line, a state park, conservation land, and a multi-use trail. The roadway has no sidewalks or bicycle lanes.

The Advisory Committee for this study met twice and identified the following issues: vehicles travel at high speed on the roadway; intersections are unsafe; the roadway lacks pedestrian and bicycle accommodations; access to adjacent developments is unsafe and inconvenient; frequent curb cuts create traffic conflicts; and there are delays at stop-controlled locations.

To address the safety issues, staff conducted a crash analysis using Registry of Motor Vehicle (RMV) crash data and police reports. The intersection at Pond Street was found to have one and a half times the average crash rate for the MassDOT District 5 area. The intersection at Beechwood Street has twice the average crash rate. The northern section of the study area has a higher crash rate than the state average, and the southern section has an even higher rate. Crashes involving pedestrians and a bicyclist have occurred in the corridor.

Staff prepared collision diagrams, which help to identify problems in the intersections that can result in crashes. The high number of crashes at the Pond Street intersection, for instance, is attributed to the lack of exclusive left-turn lanes. A high number of left

turn crashes occur at the Beechwood Street intersection in part because turning vehicles must share the inside lane with through moving vehicles.

To address the travel speed issue, staff conducted a travel speed analysis. Staff determined that the speed limit should be reduced at three locations from 50 miles per hour to 45. This would allow traffic to flow at more consistent speeds.

Staff also made recommendations for Complete Streets applications along the corridor, including the installation of continuous five-foot sidewalks on the east side of the roadway, continuous five-foot shoulders on both sides, the installation of a center turn lane or median, and driveway consolidation. Graphics were shown of the existing and proposed roadway cross sections, and the conceptual plan for improvements to each of the three sections of the study area.

The following benefits could be expected if the study recommendations implemented: vehicles would travel at more consistent speeds and drivers would have smoother transitions between speed zones; pedestrians and bicyclists would be accommodated; access to adjacent developments would be safer; and there would be safer access and mobility at the intersections. Implementation of the recommendations will require buy-in from stakeholders, and collaboration to prioritize resources, and to design and construct the improvements.

Discussion

Jay Corey, North Suburban Planning Council (City of Woburn), asked if the existing traffic signals in the corridor are coordinated and whether the study recommendations propose coordinating signals or installing adaptive signal controllers. C. Wang replied that the signals are not currently coordinated and that some of the signal equipment is old. He provided an example of a location where coordination is recommended.

Richard Reed, Minuteman Advisory Group on Interlocal Coordination (Town of Bedford), asked if the right-of-way is state-owned or municipally owned. C. Wang replied that it is state-owned.

Mike Gowing, Advisory Council, asked if the left-turn lanes on Pond Street and Beechwood Street have a dedicated left-turn signal. C. Wang said that there are no left-turn exclusive signal phases and inappropriate locations of loop detectors, which result in a high number of crashes involving left turning vehicles. The current equipment cannot provide safe access for left turning vehicles, he said.

Richard Canale, At-Large Town of Lexington, asked what effect of the proposal to reduce lanes (from two in each direction to one in each direction) would have on traffic

congestion and level of service. C. Wang replied that this treatment would not be suitable for roadways that have traffic volumes higher than 28,000 vehicles per day. The area proposed for this treatment carries a much lower traffic volume than the threshold. The only potential bottleneck is at the intersection of Beechwood Street. Staff tested the proposed layout using projected traffic volumes for the year 2020, and found that the level of service would be C or D at peak travel hours at the intersection, which is acceptable.

John Lozada, MassDOT Office of Diversity and Civil Rights, asked to what extent these types of studies include qualitative or anecdotal information or concerns from the public, including pedestrians and bicyclists. C. Wang described the sources of data that were used in this study.

8. What is Title VI?—*Elizabeth Moore, Director of Policy and Planning, MPO Staff*

E. Moore provided an overview of mandates of the Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Title VI programs of the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), and the MPO's involvement in this area.

Title VI prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, and national origin, including of people with limited English proficiency (LEP). It applies to all recipients and sub-recipients of federal assistance. Discrimination is unequal treatment and can refer to "disparate treatment," which is intentional, or "disparate impact," which may result from a policy that appears neutral but results in unequal treatment when applied. In addition to Title VI protections, in 1994 President Clinton issued an executive order that directed federal agencies to make achieving environmental justice part of their missions and to pay attention to the needs of minorities and people with low incomes.

Title VI and the environmental justice executive order differ in several ways. Title VI is a law that applies to direct recipients of federal funds, such as a state Department of Transportation (DOT) and sub-recipients, such as an MPO. Environmental justice is a federal policy that is intended to address the needs of minorities as well as people with low incomes, and address adverse health impacts to these populations. Title VI is an enforceable law that allows people to file legal complaints against an agency. The environmental justice policy, on the other hand, is intended to improve the way agencies do business, but is not a law that can be enforced in court.

FTA has been implementing its Title VI program for a number of years and issues its requirements through an FTA Circular. FHWA's Title VI/Non-Discrimination Program is newer than FTA's and still evolving.

FTA's requirements apply to transit agencies, state DOTs, and MPOs. Under the FTA Circular's general reporting requirements, these organizations must sign assurances that they comply with Title VI. They must provide the public with written notices regarding their rights and remedies under Title VI and offer a complaint procedure, and they must keep records of complaints and investigate them. They must also provide an inclusive public participation process that reaches out to minority and LEP populations, and they must report on the composition of their advisory boards. Direct recipients of federal funds must monitor compliance of their sub-recipients.

Each agency type has additional specific requirements. DOTs and MPOs must report to FTA every three years in a triennial Title VI Report. This report must include maps that show the locations of minority populations. They must also report on the distribution of transit funding across their jurisdictions and analyze this information to determine if there is a disparate distribution of funds. They must also have a process through which they determine the transportation needs of minority populations and provide opportunities for meaningful participation by those populations.

Transit agencies must set service standards and policies for vehicle load, vehicle headway, on-time performance, service coverage (the distance one must walk to access a transit service), the distribution of transit amenities (such as bus shelters, trash receptacles, maps, schedules, etc.), and vehicle assignment (the way in which specific transit vehicles are assigned to routes). FTA does not tell transit agencies what metrics or thresholds to use for each of the required standards; each agency determines these for itself and uses them as the basis for its Title VI monitoring. Each transit agency must also map the location of minority and LEP populations in relation to the transit system. This data can be used to determine what languages key documents should be translated into and for creating outreach materials.

FTA requires transit agencies to analyze the impacts of fare and service changes on both minorities and people with low incomes. Minority areas are defined as census tracts in which the percentage of the minority population exceeds the percentage of the minority population of the entire service area. FTA recommends using federal poverty guidelines as a measure for identifying low income populations, but because of the high cost of living in the Boston area, the MBTA uses a percentage of the median household income in its service area to define low-income areas.

Transit agencies must monitor their services by applying their service standards and policies to each transit route and determining whether the routes pass or fail the standards. The agencies then compare the performance of routes that serve minority areas to those that serve non-minority areas and determine whether there are

differences. The agencies must also develop a disparate impact policy that sets thresholds that the agencies use to determine whether a difference in service performance is large enough to constitute a disparate impact. If a disparate impact is found, the agencies must take steps to remedy the impact. The MBTA is currently in the process of developing its disparate impact policy.

When planning for major service or fare changes, transit agencies must conduct service equity and fare equity analyses to determine whether the changes have a disparate impact on minority populations or place a disproportionate burden on low-income populations. To do so, transit agencies must identify potential adverse effects of the service or fare changes and develop policies to define what constitutes a disparate impact or disproportionate burden. If a disparate impact or disproportionate burden is identified, the agencies must take steps to remedy it.

FHWA's Title VI/Non-discrimination Program requires state DOTs and MPOs and other sub-recipients to prepare triennial Title VI Reports. FHWA's program requirements differ from FTA's in several ways. In addition to addressing discrimination on the basis of race, color, and national origin, the FHWA program also extends to populations protected under other statutes, regulations, and executive orders that prohibit discrimination on the basis of disability, age, gender, and income. In addition, FHWA's program is more process oriented, as transit agencies provide a service that can be monitored in a way that the activities of DOTs and MPOs cannot. The FHWA program requires organizations to conduct inclusive public participation programs that include LEP populations, provide notice and establish complaint procedures, train employees and sub-recipients of what constitutes discrimination, monitor compliance, identify risk factors for discrimination in their process, and analyze data to identify if there are patterns of discrimination.

The Boston Region MPO's Transit Service Planning staff has been involved with Title VI monitoring for the MBTA for more than 20 years. Staff collects data, conducts analyses, and provides technical assistance, and for the past several years, has produced the MBTA's Triennial Report to FTA. MPO staff also supports MassDOT's reporting to both FTA and FHWA. Staff has been involved in the development of MassDOT's public participation process and language access plan. The MPO's Certification Activities Group produces the MPO's Title VI report.

Discussion

L. Dantas inquired if the reporting covers issues concerning level of service changes that may occur throughout the day (such as less frequent service in the early mornings or evenings) that may have impacts on populations protected by Title VI. E. Moore

explained that the MBTA service standards are demand-based. Each standard varies by mode and by time of day. For example when measuring vehicle load, the MBTA looks across the entire day. If vehicle loads are exceeded at any time during the day, that route will fail the standard. The vehicle headway standard is based on the provision of a minimum level of service. For example, the minimum service for a bus route is a bus per hour at off-peak times and a bus every half-hour at peak times. Service is added if vehicle loads exceed the standard during any time period. It is the interaction of the various service standards that help to ensure that minority areas receive the level of service that they require at all times of the day.

R. Mares asked if the MPO staff will be conducting a fare equity analysis for the fare hike proposed for this year. E. Moore replied yes, and noted that the analysis is part of the work program for the *MBTA 2014 Review of Fare Structure, Tariffs, and Policy*. The FTA Circular requires that an equity analysis be conducted prior to a fare change.

R. Mares asked if two equity analyses would be conducted if there are two fare change scenarios. E. Moore replied yes. There would be an analysis for each scenario presented to the public.

M. Gowing asked how the reporting of other regional transit authorities (RTAs) factors into the MBTA's or MPO's Title VI reports. E. Moore replied that RTAs that are direct recipients of federal funds report directly to FTA. RTAs that receive federal funds via MassDOT will report to MassDOT.

J. Lozada clarified that litigation brought under Title VI does not result in monetary damages. He also noted MassDOT has been hearing from the Federal Aviation Administration and National Highway Safety Administration, and that MassDOT's Aeronautics Division and RMV will also be subject to Title VI requirements. MassDOT will be working to develop a Title VI program to cover all its divisions. MassDOT will be hiring a Title VI specialist to work with the MBTA.

E. Moore added that the MPO staff is developing a work program through the UPWP that will examine ways to standardize the various analyses that the MPO staff conducts.

9. State Implementation Plan Update—Ned Codd, MassDOT

N. Codd provided an update on the projects in the State Implementation Plan (SIP), which are required as air quality mitigation for the *Central Artery/Tunnel* project.

As reported previously, MassDOT has petitioned the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to relieve MassDOT of the requirement to design the *Red Line – Blue Line Connector*

project. The construction cost of the project has increased and no funding is foreseen for the project over next 20 years. Also, there are no air quality benefits associated with designing the project. In October 2013 DEP approved MassDOT's request. MassDOT is now awaiting EPA's decision.

Regarding the *Fairmount Line Improvement* project, two new stations – Newmarket and Four Corners – opened in the summer of 2013. While both stations are operational now, the Newmarket Station will be fully completed in February 2014 and Four Corners will be fully completed later in 2014. Blue Hill Avenue Station is not complete as issues remain to be worked out with abutters. MassDOT and the MBTA are pursuing a center island design option that will reduce the impact on abutters. An independent review was conducted at the request of the abutters; that review is now being examined by the agencies.

The MBTA is moving ahead on multiple fronts on the *Green Line Extension* project, including project design and engineering and real estate issues. Regarding project financing, MassDOT and the MBTA submitted an application and finance plan to the federal New Starts Program requesting a full funding grant agreement. This application has been strengthened by the passage of the state transportation revenue law in 2013, which has put the project on a better financial footing. More information on the status of the application is expected in February 2014 when the federal budget is available.

Discussion

T. Bent remarked that there has been some misinformation circulating about the availability of mitigation measures for the delay in the *Green Line Extension* project. He asked when those measures will be released to the public. N. Codd offered to look into the question and get back to members.

10. Members Items

E. Bourassa announced that MAPC will be hosting an open house on January 28 from 4 PM to 7 PM. There will be an overview of the projects underway at MAPC. All are invited.

11. Adjourn

A motion to adjourn was made by the MassDOT Highway Division (J. Romano) and seconded by the Inner Core Committee (City of Somerville) (T. Bent). The motion carried.

Attendance

Members	Representatives and Alternates
At-Large City (City of Newton)	David Koses
At-Large Town (Town of Arlington)	Laura Wiener
At-Large Town (Town of Lexington)	Richard Canale
City of Boston (Boston Transportation Department)	Tom Kadzis
	Patrick Hoey
Inner Core Committee (City of Somerville)	Tom Bent
Massachusetts Department of Transportation	Ned Codd
	David Anderson
MassDOT Highway Division	John Romano
Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority (MBTA)	Brian Kane
Massachusetts Port Authority	Lourenço Dantas
MBTA Advisory Board	Paul Regan
Metropolitan Area Planning Council	Eric Bourassa
Minuteman Advisory Group on Interlocal Coordination (Town of Bedford)	Richard Reed
North Shore Task Force (City of Beverly)	Denise Deschamps
North Suburban Planning Council (City of Woburn)	Jay Corey
Regional Transportation Advisory Council	David Montgomery
	Mike Gowing
South Shore Coalition (Town of Braintree)	Melissa Santucci
	Rozzi
South West Advisory Planning Committee (Town of Medway)	Dennis Crowley
Three Rivers Interlocal Council (Town of Norwood/NVCC)	Tom O'Rourke
	Steve Olanoff

Other Attendees	Affiliation
Sreelatha Allam	MassDOT Office of Transportation Planning
Sarah Bradbury	MassDOT District 3
John Lozada	MassDOT Office of Diversity and Civil Rights
Rafael Mares	Conservation Law Foundation
Emily Torres-Cullinane	MAPC

MPO Staff/Central Transportation Planning Staff

Karl Quackenbush, Executive Director

Maureen Kelly

Bill Kuttner

Robin Mannion

Anne McGahan

Elizabeth Moore

Scott Peterson

Michelle Scott

Pam Wolfe
